# CITY OF EDMONDS TRANSPORTATION BENEFIT DISTRICT BOARD APPROVED MINUTES May 4, 2010

The Edmonds Transportation Benefit District meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by Board President Steve Bernheim in the Council Chambers, 250 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, Edmonds.

#### OFFICIALS PRESENT

Steve Bernheim, Board President
D. J. Wilson, Board Member
Michael Plunkett, Board Member
Adrienne Fraley-Monillas, Board Member
Diane Buckshnis, Board Member

## OFFICIALS ABSENT

Strom Peterson, Board Vice President Dave Orvis, Board Member

#### STAFF PRESENT

Stephen Clifton, Community Services/Economic Development Director
Noel Miller, Public Works Director
Bertrand Hauss, Transportation Engineer
Rob English, City Engineer
Scott Snyder, City Attorney
Sandy Chase, City Clerk
Jana Spellman, Senior Executive Council Asst.
Jeannie Dines, Recorder

# 1. <u>APPROVAL OF AGENDA</u>

BOARD MEMBER FRALEY-MONILLAS MOVED, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER PLUNKETT, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA IN CONTENT AND ORDER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

# 2. <u>CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS</u>

BOARD MEMBER BUCKSHNIS MOVED, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER PLUNKETT, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. The agenda items approved are as follows:

- A. ROLL CALL
- B. APPROVAL OF TRANSPORTATION BENEFIT DISTRICT MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 23, 2010

# 3. <u>ELECTION OF EX-OFFICIO TBD BOARD TREASURER AND WASHINGTON CITIES INSURANCE AUTHORITY REPRESENTATIVE</u>

Board President Bernheim explained at its last meeting, the TBD Board elected Community Services/Economic Development Director Stephen Clifton as Treasurer. The TBD's bylaws require that the City's Finance Director be the TBD Board's Treasurer.

BOARD PRESIDENT BERNHEIM MOVED, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER WILSON TO REVOKE THE APPOINTMENT OF STEPHEN CLIFTON AND ELECT THE CITY FINANCE DIRECTOR LORENZO HINES AS BOARD TREASURER AND WASHINGTON CITIES INSURANCE AUTHORITY REPRESENTATIVE.

Board Member Plunkett explained the TBD Board was told after electing Mr. Clifton that the TBD Board Treasurer must be the City's Finance Director. City Attorney Scott Snyder explained both State statute and the charter require the City's Finance Director to be the TBD Board Treasurer.

#### MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### 4. UPDATE FROM CITY STAFF REGARDING LIST OF PROJECT PRIORITIES

Transportation Engineer Bertrand Hauss introduced Kristina Johnson and Stohn Nishino, members of the City's Citizen Transportation Committee.

Mr. Hauss explained the 2009 Transportation Plan identified an approximately \$64 million budget shortfall to fund all the transportation projects. The total cost of the projects in the Plan was approximately \$105 million. At the March 23, 2010 TBD Board meeting, staff presented different TBD funding options such as additional vehicle license fees or redistribution of REET funds. The Board directed staff to provide a list of priority projects over the next ten years for different TBD options.

Mr. Hauss referred to a list of all the transportation projects identified in the 2009 Transportation Plan and the priority projects highlighted in yellow. He stressed the lists of priority projects were scenarios in assisting the Board in understanding the different TBD options. He noted the cost estimates that include design and construction were preliminary, prepared by the consultant as part of the Transportation Plan. More detailed estimates would be required in the future.

Mr. Hauss explained with a \$20 TBD, the TBD is collecting approximately \$500,000 per year or approximately \$5 million over the next 10 years. He explained with the current funding, the City's overlay cycle is approximately 80 years. The industry standard for overlays of arterials is 20 years and 25 years for collectors. He identified the project that could be funded via a \$20 TBD option:

• Street Overlay/Resurfacing

Mr. Hauss explained if the TBD fee was increased to \$40, the amount collected over 10 years is \$10 million. He identified additional projects that could be funded via a \$40 TBD option:

- Main Street @ 3<sup>rd</sup> Signal Upgrade
- 212<sup>th</sup> @ 84<sup>th</sup> / Five Corners Intersection Improvements
- 234<sup>th</sup> Street SW / 236<sup>th</sup> Street SW (#1 long walkway)
- Bicycle Loop signing
- Main Street @ 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue W Signal Installation
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue S (#1 short walkway)
- Citywide Traffic Calming Program
- Dayton Street (#2 short walkway)

He referred to a ranked list of short and long walkway projects identified in the Transportation Plan by the Walkway Committee.

Mr. Hauss explained if the TBD fee was increased to \$60, the amount collected over 10 years would be approximately \$15 million. He identified additional projects that could be funded via a \$60 TBD option:

- 212<sup>th</sup> @ 76<sup>th</sup> W Intersection Improvements
- 100<sup>th</sup> @ 238<sup>th</sup> Signal Upgrades
- Maple Street (#3 short walkway)
- Maplewood Drive (#2 long walkway)
- Walnut Street (#4 short walkway)
- 220<sup>th</sup> Street SW @ 76<sup>th</sup> Intersection Improvements
- Walnut Street @ 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue W Intersection Improvement
- Meadowdale Beach Road (#4 long walkway)

Mr. Hauss explained if the TBD fee was increased to \$80, the amount collected over 10 years would be approximately \$20 million. He identified additional projects that could be funded via an \$80 TBD option:

- 228<sup>th</sup> Street SW Corridor Improvements / Hwy. 99 @ 76<sup>th</sup> Intersection Improvements
- 80<sup>th</sup> Avenue W / 180<sup>th</sup> Street SW Walkway (#7 long walkway)
- Walnut Street (#5 short walkway)

He explained the projects were ranked using the Project Priority list in the Transportation Plan as well as citizen comments regarding pedestrian safety and traffic calming, the reason a number of walkway and other safety improvements were added to the list.

He provided project description for the several of the priority projects:

- Street overlays intended to improve the overlay cycle and reduce the cost of Public Works maintenance calls
- Main Street @ 3<sup>rd</sup> Signal Upgrade Trucks traveling southbound on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue North, turning right onto Main, strike the signal pole approximately twice a month as well as vehicle heads and signal poles are very old
- 212<sup>th</sup> @ 84<sup>th</sup> / Five Corners Intersection Improvements current level of service F and will continue to increase as volumes increase
- 234<sup>th</sup> Street SW / 236<sup>th</sup> Street SW (#1 long walkway) near Madrona Elementary
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue S (#1 short walkway) approximately 100 feet of sidewalk
- Citywide Traffic Calming Program identified in the Transportation Plan
- 100<sup>th</sup> @ 238<sup>th</sup> Upgrades vehicle heads and signal poles and mast arms have been in place 25-30 years and need to be updated

Mr. Hauss reviewed maps that identified the funded projects for the different TBD options, pointing out the projects were located throughout the entire City.

Kristiana Johnson, Citizen Transportation Committee, explained the Committee was involved in the preparation of the Transportation Plan. The City hired a team of consultants to work with staff and the Citizen Transportation Committee to develop a Long Range Transportation Plan for the City that considers all transportation needs through 2025. The consultants included Randy Young, Henderson Young and Company, a Transportation Financing Specialist. The Plan was adopted by the City Council in November 2009 and included in the Comprehensive Plan. The Plan is intended to be a balanced, multimodal Plan that addresses all the City's transportation needs. Projects fall into three categories, 1) road maintenance, 2) safety, and 3) concurrency. With regard to concurrency, she explained the GMA states that in order to have growth, the city must have its capital facilities in place concurrent with development; if not, development cannot occur or the Comprehensive Plan must be changed. The Plan also includes

walkway projects, curb ramp upgrades for ADA, bicycle projects, SR 104/Edmonds Way projects and traffic calming to reduce the impact of through traffic through neighborhoods.

She identified concurrency projects on the Priority Project lists that are needed by 2015:

- 212<sup>th</sup> @ 84<sup>th</sup> /Five Corners Intersection Improvements
- Main Street @ 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue W Signal Installation
- Walnut Street @ 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue W Intersection Improvement
- 228<sup>th</sup> Street SW Corridor Improvements/ Hwy. 99 @ 76<sup>th</sup> Intersection Improvements
- 80<sup>th</sup> Ave W / 180<sup>th</sup> Street SW long walkway
- Walnut Street short walkway

Mr. Hauss explained if the City obtained grants for any of the projects on the Priority List, the next project on the list would be funded.

Board Member Plunkett questioned whether Exhibit A, B and C corresponded to a TBD dollar amount. City Engineer Rob English explained Exhibit A was a list of all the projects identified in the Transportation Plan, the yellow highlight identifies project on that list that were included on the \$20, \$40, \$60 and \$80 TBD options. Exhibit B is a list of the short walkway projects and Exhibit C is a list of the long walkway projects.

Board Member Buckshnis asked why the signals at 9<sup>th</sup> @ Main, 9<sup>th</sup> @ Walnut and 9<sup>th</sup> @ Caspers that total \$2.5 million were needed before sidewalks in areas with parks and schools. Mr. Hauss answered 9<sup>th</sup> @ Main was a concurrency project. The goal was to do a variety of roadway and walkway projects. Board Member Buckshnis commented those signals were concentrated in the bowl and the existing signals were operational. The cause of the backup was the traffic light at 220<sup>th</sup> & 9<sup>th</sup>. She preferred to construct more sidewalks outside the bowl and near schools, noting parents have called her saying they want sidewalks and a child was hit last week. Mr. Hauss pointed out the 234<sup>th</sup> Street SW/236<sup>th</sup> Street SW long walkway project near Madrona was not in the bowl and was the #1 walkway identified in the Transportation Plan.

Board Member Buckshnis suggested shuffling projects to include walkways by schools, noting there was not really an issue with the blinking lights. Mr. Hauss advised the level of service (average delay at an intersection) was E, the City's level of service standard is D. Any intersection with a level of service below D was identified as a concurrency project. Board Member Buckshnis reiterated \$2.5 million was a substantial amount of money to install three traffic signals. She preferred to spend the money on sidewalks by schools and parks.

Board Member Fraley-Monillas asked how the list of projects from the Transportation Plan was prioritized. Mr. Hauss answered the Transportation Plan identified a project priority based on grant eligibility, project magnitude, and concurrency. Board Member Fraley-Monillas advised she served on the Citizen Transportation Committee in 2009 and assisted with prioritizing the projects. She did not recall that the signals at Walnut @ 9<sup>th</sup> and Caspers @ 9<sup>th</sup> were discussed during the Committee's meetings but had been added to the Transportation Plan. She referred to a project on the long walkway list, 238<sup>th</sup> from Hwy. 99 to 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue W, explaining this road has no sidewalks and is a frequently traveled route by residents between the Safeway and Lake Ballinger neighborhoods. She recalled seeing pedestrians walking in the grass area to avoid cars on the hill. She questioned why the signals at Walnut @ 9<sup>th</sup> and Caspers @ 9<sup>th</sup> were prioritized over that walkway project. Mr. Hauss responded the intersection of Walnut @ 9<sup>th</sup> as well as Main @ 9<sup>th</sup> were concurrency projects.

Board Member Fraley-Monillas responded she understood concurrency but those two signal projects were not identified as priorities during the Citizen Transportation Committee's prioritization. Mr. Hauss advised the 238<sup>th</sup> walkway was ranked 9<sup>th</sup> in the Walkway Plan and the Walkway Committee thoroughly evaluated all the areas identified as potential projects.

Board President Bernheim explained it was not his intent to adopt a project list tonight. He wanted an opportunity to review the list and look at the project locations and then schedule another TBD meeting when the projects could be discussed further.

Board Member Fraley-Monillas asked whether an additional TBD required voter approval. Board President Bernheim responded it did.

Board President Bernheim suggested Board Members submit any additional questions to him and he would refer them to staff.

# 5. <u>DISCUSSION ON PUBLIC VOTE ON TBD ASSESSMENTS IN EXCESS OF CURRENT \$20</u> <u>LICENSE FEE AND RELATIONSHIP TO BUDGET FORECAST</u>

Board Member Plunkett asked whether the \$10,000 cost of placing an issue on the ballot could be funded from existing TBD fee collections. City Attorney Scott Snyder answered it could.

Board Member Plunkett inquired about the amount of existing TBD funds. Public Works Director Noel Miller advised the TBD was collecting approximately \$500,000 per year and spending it on street maintenance and operations. The fund could accommodate a \$10,000 expenditure.

Board Member Buckshnis recalled at the last meeting the TBD had collected only \$168,000 through 2009 due to difficulties encountered with the Department of Licensing (DOL) collections. Community Services/Economic Development Director Stephen Clifton responded collections did not begin until the end of August 2009. In addition some amounts have not been collected as the DOL addresses problems with geocoding. DOL hopes to have those issues will be resolved by June. Mr. Snyder commented Edmonds was one of the first cities to enact a TBD Board and as with any new program, there have been difficulties.

Board Member Wilson pointed out the City Council approved the list of projects via approval of the Transportation Plan in November 2009 and the list of priority projects is a subset of that list. He pointed out the 84<sup>th</sup> Avenue West project (212<sup>th</sup> Street SW – 238<sup>th</sup> Street SW) with a cost of \$16 million has been on the list of priorities for approximately 10 years. The reason it did not score higher on the priority list was because of it was a regional project of significance. He recalled when the Regional Transportation Investment District (RTID), a tri-county agency was created in 2001, Edmonds had 2-3 projects including Edmonds Crossing and the 84<sup>th</sup> Avenue West project. He relayed the City's lobbyist Mike Doubleday has indicated there may be a state transportation package next year. It may be appropriate to request State funds for larger projects such as the 84<sup>th</sup> Avenue West project that are not funded via a TBD.

Board President Bernheim suggested Board Members review the projects including their physical locations and determine at a future meeting whether to place a TBD assessment on the November ballot.

Board Member Wilson advised the Board had until the second Tuesday in August to take action to place an issue on the November ballot. If it was not placed on the November ballot, the cost was typically higher. He recalled the City Council's 6-1 vote last November to support placing an additional \$80 vehicle license tab fee on the ballot, noting the funding in the Transportation Plan was premised on that funding source.

Board Member Buckshnis relayed a comment from a Port Commissioner regarding REET funding for transportation projects. Mr. Hauss recalled he forwarded the Port Commissioner previous PowerPoint slides from City Council meetings. Board Member Buckshnis requested that information also be submitted to the Board.

Board President Bernheim advised another TBD Board meeting would be scheduled in the next 4-6 weeks.

Board Member Fraley-Monillas asked whether staff would provide a recommendation regarding a TBD funding level. Mr. Clifton responded it was the TBD Board's decision.

# 6. BRIEFING ON PROPOSED SNOHOMISH COUNTY TBD FORMATION

Board President Bernheim referred to a letter from Snohomish County inquiring whether the City was interested in participating in a countywide TBD.

Board Member Buckshnis advised she contacted Brian Goodnight, Senior Legislative Analysis, Snohomish County Council, who was very complimentary regarding how visionary Edmonds was in establishing its own TBD and stating there was no reason for the City to participate.

## 7. <u>AUDIENCE COMMENTS</u>

**Al Rutledge, Edmonds**, commented the previous TBD Board meetings were held late in the evening following City Council meetings. He was surprised there was not more public present when the TBD Board meeting was held at an earlier time. He suggested anyone who has commented at a TBD Board meeting in the past be notified of upcoming meetings.

#### 8. **BOARD COMMENTS**

Board Members had no comment.

#### 9. <u>ADJOURN</u>

With no further business, the TBD Board meeting was adjourned at 6:53 p.m.